

**Response to Office Action Mailed October 18, 2007**

**A. Claims In The Case**

Claims 1-16 have been rejected. Claims 2-3, 5, 6-9, and 10 have been objected to. Claims 1, 6, 10, 11, 12, and 15 have been amended. Claims 3-5, and 16 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 17-22 have been added. Claims 1-2, 6-15, and 17-22 are pending in the case.

**B. Drawings**

The Examiner objected to drawings stating that the “drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims.” Applicant has amended claims 12 and 15 for clarification and believes that such clarification renders the Examiner’s objections moot.

**C. Abstract**

The abstract was objected to as being in improper form. Applicant has amended the abstract for clarification.

**D. The Claims Are Not Indefinite Pursuant To 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph**

Claims 2-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 2-6 have been canceled or amended for clarification. Applicant submits that all the claims are now definite.

**E. The Claims Are Not Indefinite Pursuant To 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph**

Claims 12, 15, and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Claims 12, 15, and 16 have been canceled or amended for clarification. Applicant submits that all the claims are now definite.

**F. Claims 2, 3, and 5 Have Been Substantially Rewritten in Independent Form**

In the Office Action, the Examiner stated that claims 2, 3, and 5 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome any rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 and in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 1, and the claims dependent on claim 1 (claims 2, 6-15, 17, and 21), now includes features from claims 2 and 3. New claim 18, and the claims dependent on claim 18 (claims 19, 20, and 22), now includes features from claim 5. As such, Applicant submits that claims 1 and 18, and the claims dependent thereon, are in condition for allowance.

**G. The Claims Are Not Anticipated By The Cited Art Pursuant To 35 U.S.C. § 102**

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, 11, and 13-14 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,898,388 to Hoffman ("Hoffman"). Applicant respectfully disagrees with these rejections.

Claim 1 describes a combination of features including but not limited to the following features:

1. An instrumented antifriction bearing device comprising:
  - a rotating portion;
  - a nonrotating portion; and
  - an assembly configured to detect rotation parameters, wherein the assembly comprises:

an encoder ;  
a sensor, wherein the sensor is integrated with the nonrotating portion, and  
wherein the sensor comprises:  
    a sensor unit;  
    at least one reception microcoil and at least one transmission microcoil,  
    each microcoil being a substantially flat winding,

wherein said microcoils are positioned on a support of a circuit that is coupled to  
the sensor unit of the nonrotating portion, and wherein said microcoils are  
configured to be positioned axially opposite the encoder.

Applicant submits that the combination of features of claim 1 are not taught or suggested  
by Hoffman.

**H.    Summary**

Based on the above, Applicant submits that all claims are now in condition for allowance.  
Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.